



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/487,411	06/07/95	HARVEY	J 5634.318

THOMAS J SCOTT JR
HOWREY & SIMON
1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

LM61/0226 7

EXAMINER	
SAFOUREK, B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2732	

DATE MAILED: 02/26/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

407,411

Office Action Summary

Application No.

00/407,411

Applicant(s)

Harvey et al

Examiner

Safouet

Group Art Unit

2732

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—**Period for Response**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0-12-97
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 12-27 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 12-27 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2732

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed August 12, 1997.

DOUBLE PATENTING V.S. PATENTS

2. After reviewing the restriction requirement under 35 USC 121 in US Patent 5,233,654 it is believed that the claims of the instant application are subject to a double patenting analysis against US Patent 4,704,725, 4,965,825, 5,109,414, 5,233,654 and US Patent 5,335,277.

3. In view of further analysis and applicant's arguments, the rejection of the claims in the instant application under double patenting based on the broad analysis of *In re Schneller* as set forth in paragraphs 7-10 of the previous Office Action has been withdrawn.

4. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985) *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art. Unit: 2732

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 2 - 10 and 12 - 27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims *** of U.S. Patent No.4,704,725, 4,965,825, 5,109,414, 5,233,654 and 5,335,277. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because; claim 2 differs from claim 59 of 5,233,654 by specifying that the member datum of claim 59 can be any one of several types of financial data; claims 3-6 differ from claim 29 of 5,335,277 only in that the "instructions" for the patent claim would be code; claims 7-9 are obvious over claim 3 of 4,704,725 because any station could be controlled; claims 10, 12 - 14 and 16 - 27 are obvious over claim 25 of 4,965,825 and claim 21 of 5,109,414 and claim 15 is obvious over claim 6 of 5,233,654.

DOUBLE PATENTING BETWEEN APPLICATIONS

6. Conflicts exist between claims of the following related co-pending applications which includes the present application:

Art Unit: 2732

#	Ser. No.	#	Ser. No.	#	Ser. No.
1	397371	2	397582	3	397636
4	435757	5	435758	6	437044
7	437045	8	437629	9	437635
10	437791	11	437819	12	437864
13	437887	14	437937	15	438011
16	438206	17	438216	18	438659
19	439668	20	439670	21	440657
22	440837	23	441027	24	441033
25	441575	26	441577	27	441701
28	441749	29	441821	30	441880
31	441942	32	441996	33	442165
34	442327	35	442335	36	442369
37	442383	38	442505	39	442507
40	444643	41	444756	42	444757
43	444758	44	444781	45	444786
46	444787	47	444788	48	444887
49	445045	50	445054	51	445290

Art Unit: 2732

52	445294	53	445296	54	445328
55	446123	56	446124	57	446429
58	446430	59	446431	60	446432
61	446494	62	446553	63	446579
64	447380	65	447414	66	447415
67	447416	68	447446	69	447447
70	447448	71	447449	72	447496
73	447502	74	447529	75	447611
76	447621	77	447679	78	447711
79	447712	80	447724	81	447726
82	447826	83	447908	84	447938
85	447974	86	447977	87	448099
88	448116	89	448141	90	448143
91	448175	92	448251	93	448309
94	448326	95	448643	96	448644
97	448662	98	448667	99	448794
100	448810	101	448833	102	448915
103	448916	104	448917	105	448976
106	448977	107	448978	108	448979
109	449097	110	449110	111	449248

Art Unit: 2732

112	449263	113	449281	114	449291
115	449302	116	449351	117	449369
118	449411	119	449413	120	449523
121	449530	122	449531	123	449532
124	449652	125	449697	126	449702
127	449717	128	449718	129	449798
130	449800	131	449829	132	449867
133	449901	134	450680	135	451203
136	451377	137	451496	138	451746
139	452395	140	458566	141	458699
142	458760	143	459216	144	459217
145	459218	146	459506	147	459507
148	459521	149	459522	150	459788
151	460043	152	460081	153	460085
154	460120	155	460187	156	460240
157	460256	158	460274	159	460387
160	460394	161	460401	162	460556
163	460557	164	460591	165	460592
166	460634	167	460642	168	460668
169	460677	170	460711	171	460713

Art Unit: 2732

172	460743	173	460765	174	460766
175	460770	176	460793	177	460817
178	466887	179	466888	180	466890
181	466894	182	467045	183	467904
184	468044	185	468323	186	468324
187	468641	188	468736	189	468994
190	469056	191	469059	192	469078
193	469103	194	469106	195	469107
196	469108	197	469109	198	469355
199	469496	200	469517	201	469612
202	469623	203	469624	204	469626
205	470051	206	470052	207	470053
208	470054	209	470236	210	470447
211	470448	212	470476	213	470570
214	470571	215	471024	216	471191
217	471238	218	471239	219	471240
220	472066	221	472399	222	472462
223	472980	224	473213	225	473224
226	473484	227	473927	228	473996
229	473997	230	473998	231	473999
232	474119	233	474139	234	474145
235	474146	236	474147	237	474496

Art Unit: 2732

238	474674	239	474963	240	474964
241	475341	242	475342	243	477547
244	477564	245	477570	246	477660
247	477711	248	477712	249	477805
250	477955	251	478044	252	478107
253	478544	254	478633	255	478767
256	478794	257	478858	258	478864
259	478908	260	479042	261	479215
262	479216	263	479217	264	479374
265	479375	266	479414	267	479523
268	479524	269	479667	270	480059
271	480060	272	480383	273	480392
274	480740	275	481074	276	482573
277	482574	278	482857	279	483054
280	483169	281	483174	282	483269
283	483980	284	484275	285	484276
286	484858	287	484865	288	485282
289	485283	290	485507	291	485775
292	486258	293	486259	294	486265
295	486266	296	486297	297	487155
298	487397	299	487408	300	487410
301	487411	302	487428	303	487506

Art Unit: 2732

304	487516	305	487526	306	487536
307	487546	308	487556	309	487565
310	487649	311	487851	312	487895
313	487980	314	487981	315	487982
316	487984	317	488032	318	488058
319	488378	320	488383	321	488436
322	488438	323	488439	324	488619
325	488620	326	498002	327	511491
328	485773	329	113329		

7. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. The attached Appendix provides clear evidence that such conflicting claims exist between the 329 related co-pending applications identified above. However, an analysis of all claims in the 329 related co-pending applications would be an extreme burden on the Office requiring millions of claim comparisons.

In order to resolve the conflict between applications, applicant is required to either:

- (1) file terminal disclaimers in each of the related 329 applications terminally disclaiming each of the other 329 applications, or;
- (2) provide an affidavit attesting to the fact that all claims in the 329 applications have been reviewed by applicant and that no conflicting claims exists between the applications. Applicant

Art Unit: 2732

should provide all relevant factual information including the specific steps taken to insure that no conflicting claims exist between the applications, or;

(3) resolve all conflicts between claims in the above identified 329 applications by identifying how all the claims in the instant application are distinct and separate inventions from all the claims in the above identified 329 applications (note: the five examples in the attached Appendix are merely illustrative of the overall problem. Only correcting the five identified conflicts would not satisfy the requirement).

Failure to comply with the above requirement will result in abandonment of the application.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

8. Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's Information Disclosure Statements filed December 4, 1995, December 22, 1995, February 6, 1996 and April 7, 1997. In view of the unusually large number of references cited in the instant application (approximately 2,200 originally and 645 in the subsequent IDS) and the failure of applicant to point out why such a large number of references is warranted, these references have been considered in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97 and 1.98 to the best ability by the examiner with the time and resources available.

The foreign language references cited therein where there is no statement of relevance or no translation are not in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.98 and have not been considered.

Numerous references listed in the IDS are subsequent to applicant's latest effective filing date of 9/11/87, therefore, the relevancy of these references is unclear. Also cited are numerous references that are apparently unrelated to the subject matter of the instant invention such as: US

Art Unit: 2732

Patent # 33,189 directed toward a beehive, GB 1565319 directed toward a chemical compound, a cover sheet with only the word "ZING", a computer printout from a library search with the words "LST" on it and a page of business cards including that of co-inventor James Cuddihy, among others. The relevancy of these references cannot be ascertained. Furthermore, there are several database search results listed in foreign languages (such as German) which list only the title and document information; no copy has been provided, therefore, these references have not been considered.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 112

9. Claims 2-10 and 12 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

37 C.F.R. 1.75(d)(1) requires that:

"the terms and the phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description".

The following limitations were not supported by the specification as originally filed:

In claims 2, 7,10 and 15, the financial analysis, in claim 3, the target processor and the digital television of claim 26.

Art Unit: 2732

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(c) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 a as being anticipated by WO81/02961(newly cited). WO81/02961 (Campbell) was published on October 15, 1981, before the date of November 3, 1981 argued by applicant's on page 13 of the August 12, 1997 response. The arguments on pages 24 and 25 of the response are noted. In Figure 17 Campbell has both tier and program enabled codes that represent financial data as to payment for services. The control signal is extracted from the vertical interval. Campbell thus has the claimed financial analysis and control signal.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2732

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 3 - 10 and 12 - 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell (WO 81/02961) in view of Hedger et al. The arguments on pages 25 -28 of the August 12, 1997 response have been thoroughly reviewed. On page 25 applicants argue that there must be some suggestion to combine in the references. If this requirement were true there would be no need for 35 U. S. C. 103 as then the reference with the suggestion to combine would be anticipatory. Campbell has the financial analysis and Hedger the downloadable code. Campbell certainly has a signal, equivalent to the "instruct" signal that causes steps 322, 324 or 330 to be executed. the claimed transmitter is shown in Figure 2 of Campbell. The dependent claims are obvious as in the previous office action. The new claims are obvious because any signal can be imbedded in a higher bandwidth signal and Campbell has viewer reaction.

14.B. V. Safourek

703-305-4364

Serial Number:08/487,411

Page 14

Art Unit: 2732

Benedict V. Safourek

BENEDICT V. SAFOUREK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2732